

380571

OST-2003-15759-322

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: JUDY BOSTICK

Address: 1412 PRIMROSE
CONROE TX 77385

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Paula Bridges

Name:

PAULA BRIDGES

Address:

503, Hartwick
Houston TX 77013

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,


Name: Carrie Davis
Address: 1112 W Temple
Arlington, TX 77009

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Michael Huns

Address:

*P.O. Box 740147
Houston, TX 77274*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *PATRICIA ESCOFFERY*

Address: *16411 SALIDA DE SOL
HOLSON TR 77083*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,


Name: CAROLYN Friedman

Address: 10362 GINA COURT
HOUSTON TX 77064

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Carol Szalay*
Address: *16338 Long Valley Ct.*
Conroe, TX 77302

16 DEC 2005

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:


JAMES O. GILBERT
9911 CLUBHOUSE CIRCLE
MAGNOLIA, TX 77354

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Sheryl C. Hateggen*
Address: *15751 Cooper Breaks.
Humble, TX 77346*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:


Dawn Koch
29714 Valley Center Dr.
Spring, TX 77386

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name: TERESA LACEY

Address: 14521 REEVES ROAD
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77039

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Scarlet Lara*

Address: *7326 Wimberley Oaks Lane
Richmond TX 77469*

12/16/05

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Roger Lewis

Name:

Roger Lewis

Address:

18351 KYKENDAH 229
Spring, TX 77379

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Dynna Lewis

Address:

*319 Hickory Ridge Dr
Spring, TX 77381*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name:

SHAWNA MEYER

Address: 10710 Lake Windcrest
Magnolia, TX 77354

380571

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
DOCKETS

2006 JAN -6 P 2:58

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Deborah Rutland

Address:

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name:

martha Sagastegui

Address:

16823 Sinaloa Dr.

Houston, TX 77033

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: STEBRA SCHULTZ
Address: 4610 Ackley Dr,
Humble TX 77396

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: MELISSA SHRAKE

Address: 4530 ROSEGATE
SPRING, TX 77373

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Melissa Shrake". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name and address.

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Rita Thakkar, ESD Supv.*

Address: *2823 Fieldline Dr
Sugarland, Tx 77479*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.


I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: Shawn Vanderworp

Address: 23227 Kobi Park Ct Spring TX 77373

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Shawn Vanderworp". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'S'.

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *NORMA WANTS*

Address: *8311 Fm 1960 E. # 1414*
Humble, TX 77346

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: JANE WHITAKER
Address: 3014 ALLISON DR
HUMBLE, TX 77396

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name: EMMA ZULUAGA

Address: 810 REDWING PLACE DR
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77009

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: 

Address: 

PO Box 420414
Houston TX 77242